CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLIII No 3 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* March 1991

Democracy after Thatcher

by John Wilkes

In the Hegelian philosophy, democracy undergoes subtle changes which would make it quite unrecognisable to the pioneers who fought so hard and so unremittingly for the universal suffrage. It becomes more of a cosmetic or a palliative, something which makes the recipient feel good without bestowing any substance. Hegel's democrat supports his parliament or his congress because, in electing it, he is allowed to assume that his principles and his opinions have some value.

Power itself is one stage removed, being vested in a cabal or oligarchy which takes decisions outwith the glare of public debate or interest. Thus policy is effected by means of the coup, the *fait accompli*, the vital issue which has somehow been introduced, discussed and made into a binding commitment before even the most conscientious Member of Parliament or congressman has had a chance to consult his constituents.

Antony Sutton, that brilliant British-born academic who has done so much to alert the world to how it was Western finance and industrial combines which created the monster we knew as Soviet Communism, showed more recently that Hegelian concepts had come to dominate the thinking of that self-perpetuating political and banking plutocracy which rules America.

Likewise it is the modern-day Hegelians who are set to impose their ideas and their administrative structure upon the projected United States of Europe. Few people in Britain knew anything about the Frenchman Jacques Delors until in April 1989, as President of the European Commission, he produced the *Report on Economic & Monetary Union* which bears his name. If that earth-shaking document was discreetly ordered into existence, it was even more circumspectly circulated and publicised. A news media which openly boasts its untrammelled independence, its widely heralded prerogative to publish and be damned, can often be very selective in alerting or sedating the public when it comes to matters of vital significance.

But the press itself is now a part of the Hegelian concept. Controlled and monitored by millionaire financial interests, its ever more voluminous editions and coloured supplements are designed to distract, amuse and titillate, yet not to inform. *If that were not so, how could all the vast galaxy of mass communication technology have failed to register the fact that national sovereignty, that essential characteristic of our Britishness, the issue upon which we had fought and sacrificed in two World Wars, was about to be abolished by a committee?*

Nanny government, "officialdom knows best," and all other aspects of intrusive bureaucracy, are part of the same process. It has been going on for some time. One should note that when the totalitarian slave states of Stalin's East European empire had consolidated their hold upon the subject peoples, they called themselves democracies. And true enough, there was a token commitment to community participation, in that they held periodic elections under universal suffrage. Western observers thought this very funny, since there was invariably only one state-appointed candidate, and he got 98% of the vote.

The pattern for the new U.S. of E. will be subtly different. Multi-party systems in the regions will continue to debate the issues, and send their elected representatives, at vastly increased salaries and overheads, to prestigious assemblies in the heartland of Europe, but in the end the really vital decisions will be taken by a politburo, or committee. The Hegelian ideal will be seen to have been observed, in that the electorates will have had their say. Their opinions will have been invited. And in the glow of apparent participation, with a compliant popular press to lull them, they will not be expected to notice that they have effectively lost all power to change things.

BIG banking and multinational industrial corporatism will also be essential ingredients of the Hegelian new world. Already much deference is being extended to the merchant adventurers who are expected to increase our prosperity many-fold as they expand into the mighty European Single Market. It used to be said that what was good for General Motors was good for the USA. Likewise it becomes tantamount to Luddism and industrial sabotage to infer that narrow considerations of national sovereignty and political parochialism should be allowed to impede our wheeling, dealing, contract-swinging corporate wonder-men as they go on demanding first of all a continent, and then a world without frontiers.

Not that the doyens of Euro-marketing have benefited us much from the opportunities afforded them thus far! In a recently published pamphlet entitled *The Conservative Party and the EEC*, a group of British MPs have shown that out of a current balance of trade deficit running to about £20 billion, some £14.5 billion is with our EC partners, including no less than £9.6 billion with our main competitors in West Germany. So who has most to gain when the barriers come down?

Political and economic wisdom has not always blessed the councils of the CBI. They hailed Nigel Lawson in the mid 1980s as the brilliant architect of Thatcher's economic miracle, and predicted downturn and problems for the economy when he was manoeuvred into resignation in the autumn of 1989. It took them a further twelve months to realise that Lawson himself was the problem-maker, that his obstinate refusal to apply credit controls against the flood of easy money from abroad - that and the antediluvian policy of merely pushing up interest rates in an effort to curb the consequent inflation - was responsible for the rising unemployment, reduced economic activity and adverse trade balances that were encountered in the 1990s.

Businessmen as the arbiters of our political future? Just look back on the record.

MORE insistent than the calls for corporatist hegemony are the siren voices of those who would leave it all to the bankers. That is a feature of the Delors blueprint, with its proposals for a European Central Bank whose decision-making would be autonomous, and totally outwith the jurisdiction and control of national parliaments. Bankers are in the business of creating and managing money, say the pundits, so why not just give them the lot, and let them get on with it, free of political pressure or electoral instability? Semi-permanent officials, endowed with what Delors calls "appropriate security of tenure", holding in their hands our financial lifeline, and immune from criticism or replacement! Democracy?

It was all so different in the days of Abraham Lincoln when he declared that *"the privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of Government, but ... is the Government's greatest creative opportunity."*

Amschel Rothschild put it differently when he said, *"Let me issue and control a nation's money, and I care not who writes its laws."*

Thomas Jefferson thought that banking institutions *"having the issuing power of money"* were *"more dangerous to liberty than standing armies"*.

William Greider, in his monumental work *Secrets of the Temple*, published in New York in 1987, remarks how the Populists of the last century, though they were only poor downtrodden farming folks desperately striving to keep body and soul together, had a much deeper understanding of money issues than our sophisticated modern citizenry, who may be willing to accept Lincoln and Jefferson as giants of the past, but simply do not understand what they were talking about when they insisted that free nations must retain control of their own credit.

Greider put this down to a "collective blocking out" process, in which the media, the educational system and every important cultural institution cooperated to ensure that money regulation would be regarded in the public mind as "an arcane technical matter, an obscure managerial function of government without much importance to the great issues of democratic discourse". His own approach to the subject, in which he portrays the Federal Reserve Bank of the USA as an inner temple where high priests practise an occult science,is intended to show how monetary considerations have been progressively channelled away into a mystique that is no longer open to intellectual criticism or new ideas. Obviously the Hegelians had been at it again.

THE seemingly unstoppable drive to place our financial and economic future in the hands of a non-elected committee of bank governors sitting in Frankfurt or Brussels, has to be viewed against the carefully cultivated image of banking and its associated mythology which comes through to us from our

mentors in the economics columns of the Establishment press. The banker is seen to be disciplined where society itself is undisciplined. He can afford to be impartial where the elected politician must always pay heed to the views of those who put him in power. And in any case, where it's a matter of money management, why not do the obvious, and give the job to the professionals?

It must be apparent that power structures advance eccentrically in this new age of supranational intrigue, where the only thing that can be assumed with certainty is that things are never quite what they seem. If mankind, through ignorance, apathy or neglect, is about to lurch into some new form of subtle subjugation, it does not matter essentially whether the system is called Fascism, Socialism, Marxism, Maoism or International Capitalism. He who would call himself a democrat must retain as his vital criterion the inalienable right by popular will to change both policies and personalities. Unwieldy internationalist groupings, and distant centres of financial overlordship, make this both technically and administratively impracticable.

For those with an irresistible leaning towards tyranny in one shape or other, the old collectivist style of dictatorship has recently gone out of fashion, but quick to respond in a changing situation, Hegel's disciples promptly opted for 'Bankerism' as their control vehicle of the future. This is not to be confused with Mercantilism, or Industrial Capitalism, or indeed any such productive and investment-orientated philosophy that aims to maximise wealth-creating potential. Bankerism is mainly concerned with usury, with the linking of all commercial, industrial and social activity to the debt structure.

Greider illustrates the evils that can be compounded when banking professionals wield effective control over economic policy. Under the chairmanship of Paul Volcker, in 1980 the US Federal Reserve started to regulate the money supply by interest rates alone. Thereafter the US economy went on what Greider describes as a "roller coaster", with the cost of Federal Funds varying between 8% and 21.5%. This was to cause boom-and-bust, bankruptcies and failures, unemployment,social uncertainty, and amongst the lower orders and ethnic minorities, much deprivation and misery.

Bad enough for America, the world's richest and most prosperous society! But what of the commodity producers of the Third World who in the previous decade had borrowed sums totalling some $1,200 billion from those same American bankers caught up in Volcker's credit squeeze? In some cases it suddenly cost twice as much to service their debts, whilst the price of their commodity in dollar terms was going down.

It has been calculated that the resultant situation meant a nett outflow of capital and resources from the poorest to the richest nations. The cost in human terms, in malnutrition, infant mortality, stunted lives and sheer mind-numbing hopelessness may have surpassed many of the more torrid episodes of the Second World War. It happened because bankers were allowed to do their own thing, heedless of the wider consequences.

Any more for the new Euro-bankerocracy?

Reprinted in abridged form with acknowledgement to the Western Goals Institute, BCM Box 9045, London WC1N 3XX.

NEWS FROM THE GULLIBLE GULF

WE read in a recent issue of **Private Eye** that top marks for disinformation during the Gulf War go to the BBC and the Ministry of Defence for their coup over the pictures of two captured Tornado pilots. The way in which the Iraqi television pictures of their battered faces was used by the BBC skilfully suggested they had been tortured by the secret police in Baghdad. The tabloid press here responded loyally with anti-Saddam headlines like: THE BASTARD IS TORTURING OUR BOYS. Only after the war was over did the wife of one of the pilots disclose that the film had been secretly edited by the BBC from a complete, unedited version handed to her at the time on condition she kept quiet. On the un-broadcast part of the tape her husband sent his family his love and told them not to worry about his bruises. They had been collected, he said, when he ejected from his aircraft and landed head- first in the desert! In fact, such injuries are very common when pilots eject.

MORE TROUBLE THAN HE'S WORTH

NOEL HUNT wonders if some punishments could be more cost-effective

"FOR what has caused more suffering than the follies of the compassionate?" [Fredrich Nietzche, **Thus Spake Zarathustra**]

A recent press article paints a word-portrait of Wayne, described as "the identikit criminal." He is said to be "feckless, amoral, shrewd and a burglar," and to have been a criminal since he was eight years old. He lives with his aunt in "a squalid social security bedsit," furnished only with two beds. Note the impeccable social conscience displayed by the writer of the article, and feel guilty because as a taxpayer you have not provided this dreg with something better than the "squalid" room. Wayne has few possessions and no money. He has not the slightest intention of mending his ways. He regards prison as merely an opportunity to learn fresh tricks of his deplorable trade. We are told that there are thousands of Waynes.

To the social scientists and other believers in the perfectability of man Wayne is a challenge and an opportunity. The Waynes of this world are seen as a living proof of the truth of all their fallacious beliefs. Confronted by ever-growing numbers of Waynes, these men of goodwill redouble their efforts to obtain more and ever more of the taxpayers' money. They are certain that if the material circumstances of all the Waynes are improved, they will mend their wicked ways, thus bringing the earthly paradise a little closer to us all.

Credit And Debit

To the thousands of professional "carers" Wayne is a heartening sight. So long as society produces ever-growing numbers of Waynes, their jobs become ever more secure. To the taxpayer, the Waynes of the world are an expensive nuisance. While Wayne is in prison it costs the taxpayer a large sum every month to keep him there. While at liberty, and planning further burglaries, he is drawing benefits, again at the taxpayers' expense. To the social worker Wayne is a "claimant" or "one of the long term unwaged." To the taxpayer he is a layabout and a heavy expense.

From the article it seems clear that all the Waynes have never contributed a penny towards the common stock, or done anything to justify their existence. What is more they will almost certainly continue to be permanent and expensive pests. So why should the tax payer be burdened with the expense of people like Wayne, who will never be anything but a financial liability? Why should society not rid itself of this expensive incubus by imposing a swift and merciful death? It may be objected that a purely financial criterion, and that alone, has been used in passing judgement on Wayne. It is true that a few years ago such a criterion would have been inappropriate. Yet what other is left to us today?

Until quite recently it would not have been possible to set a purely monetary value on a human life. Such an approach is unthinkable in a Christian society. Yet we are assured on all sides that today we live in a secular society. In fact, this statement is often made by clerics themselves, well paid and housed to preach the Christian gospel. We have become a pagan society; the social gospel is everywhere preached

instead of that of Christ. With its deep commitment to "social justice," it is futile to look to the established church for guidance on how to deal with people like Wayne.

Perhaps some would argue that as a member of the Caucasian race, probably the most valuable human stock ever produced, Wayne is worth keeping alive. Perhaps they would, and perhaps he is; but our rulers do not think so. They have set up here a highly unpopular multi-racial society. And if further proof is needed that our politicians are unmoved by the thought of the disappearance of our race, consider their response to the threat of AIDS. A state which thought its indigenous ethnic stock worth preserving would long ago have insisted on quarantine and removal from society of those who suffer from this incurable and highly contagious disease. In fact, indifferent to the fate of our national stock and lacking the courage to confront the homosexual lobby, our rulers have taken no action beyond misleading and largely futile media campaigns. So what other criterion have we than the purely financial?

It is pointless to base appeals founded on Christian ethics to politicians who are happy to live in a secular society. It is equally futile to appeal on a racial basis to politicians who all preach the desirability of a multi-racial society. The only lever left to the public is a refusal to pay taxes which are spent on keeping professional criminals in comfort.

Audit For Action

So what seems to be needed is a vigorous campaign to inform the tax paying public of the number of long-term and recidivist prisoners, their total cost to the taxpayer, and an estimate of the amount that could be saved by a swift and merciful elimination of these costly pests. Armed with this information, taxpayers could then make a serious attempt to convince the public that Wayne and his like are more trouble than they are worth; and that they should be removed in the interests of the law-abiding taxpayer.

There seems to be no other way of reducing the huge and ever-growing financial burden represented by Wayne and by the long-term prisoners who grow ever more numerous as society grows ever more afraid to act firmly against them. Enormous sums would be saved by giving such people a merciful death, while law and order would receive a powerful impetus. It might even be possible to walk our streets again without fear.

Why should society not act in this way to protect itself? Since religious, moral, ethical and racial views are equally despised by our political masters, only the financial yardstick remains. It would have a great appeal to the hard-pressed taxpayer, and would benefit us all. Since it offers a prospect of a reduction in taxation, it is an argument which at least would be listened to attentively by every tax payer. That great man Jefferson hit the nail on the head when he remarked, "The purse of the people is the real seat of sensibility. Let it be drawn upon largely, and they will listen to truths which would not excite them through any other organ." [Thomas Jefferson, **Writings**, Volume X].

CANDOUR needs more subscribers! Have YOU secured one yet?

JUSTICE DEMANDS THE DEATH PENALTY

FRANK BROOKES explains why capital punishment is not morally wrong

RETRIBUTION, Restitution and Reformation - in that order - should be the aim and policy of any Right-thinking Government in dealing with the problem of crime in Britain. When crime has been committed, particularly against the person, the balance of justice has been disturbed, and only condign punishment will serve to adjust it. One of the chief reasons for the existence of government at all is to ensure safety for the individual citizen as he or she goes about his or her daily business. Daily in this country, as well as in the U.S., this degree of safety is eroded as murders, muggings, kidnaps and thefts, not to mention sexual assaults, take place on our streets and in our homes.

A fearful and indignant populace cries out against the slap on the wrist all too often meted out as "punishment" by the Courts. The do-gooders in our midst show more concern for the criminal than for the victim and softness runs riot. It is regrettable but seemingly true that no one in authority is capable of grasping the unpleasant nettle of crime and violence; no one is prepared to make any serious attempt to make things so hard for the evil-doers in our society that crime becomes not merely less attractive but positively dangerous for those engaged in perpetrating it.

Potential For Patriots

It would be worthwhile for political movements like the British National Party and National Front to make a strong bid for public support from the electorate by fighting the corner of public safety and the return of law and order as the main platform in their campaigning. This would not mean watering down their attitudes and policies on immigration; however, a more pressing concern among most Britons today does seem to be that they - and their property - should be as safe from molestation as can humanly be achieved.

Prisons being already overcrowded, provision of work camps where violent offenders could be housed while they work off their debt to society seems to be a reasonable possibility. Such work camps would exist to supply manual labour for various heavy projects as and where needed. They would thereby fulfil both the retributive and restorative aspects of the requirements of justice. Incarceration in the camps would be punishment and the physical labour undertaken would help to restore the balance of injustice which they inflicted on society as a whole. Their free time would not be spent watching television or playing football, but in under-going whatever programme of rehabilitation might be decided upon to help re-fit them for a return to society.

But what about murder? This is a crime so serious that it warrants particular consideration. Clearly there would need to be legislation that recognises several categories of murder. The crime of passionate killing by the wronged partner in a marriage is clearly not to be placed on the same footing as terrorism, political murder or delegated assassination. Cold-blooded murder should be punished by death, but only after the most thorough investigation of the circumstances.

Harsh though it may seem, this writer would also recommend that in any

case wherein deliberately false evidence has been given by anyone, police or other, in order to secure conviction, should such falsity be satisfactorily proved, then the offender be given the identical punishment which his or her lying evidence caused to be inflicted on the previously accused.

Many people, in the mistaken belief that they are being "loving" and "Christian," show far more concern for the evil-doer than for his or her victim. In this they are theologically and scripturally unsound. The reverence for life which Christianity teaches includes reverencing the lives of victims of violence. Theirs is the prime claim on our conscience and on our laws. Only after their rights have been vindicated do the rights of offenders claim our attention.

Cheapening Of Human Life

In a totally erroneous and unsound form of so-called Christian argument, some people claim that capital punishment is morally wrong. They advance the "seamless garment" argument which says that if you condemn abortion as evil, so too you reject the death penalty as equally evil. The argument is spurious because it totally ignores the distinction which needs to be made between the taking deliberately of innocent human life (which is murder) and the taking of human life which has been proved guilty of some serious crime against another human being (which is punishment). Opposition to the death penalty does not prove respect for human life. On the contrary, it cheapens human life because it permits the taking of human life by killers without applying condign punishment.

Opponents within the Christian body of the death penalty usually quote in support of their view the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." I am assured by scripture scholars who should know that the word "kill" here is erroneous and should, in fact, read "murder." On making this claim on one occasion from a public platform, I was accused by an angry lady (a Catholic Justice and Peace member) that I was saying this "just because it suits you." I pointed out that only the statement "Thou shalt not murder" makes sense. "Thou shalt not kill" does not, for almost immediately following that quotation (Exodus 20:13) comes another command, "Whoever strikes a man so that he dies shall be put to death..." (Exodus 21:12-14). The people to whom the commandments were given made the natural and commonsense distinction between accidental and wilful killing, providing refuge cities for the former and punishment for the latter.

Modern Anglo-Saxon society lives in contradiction: squeamish to the point of softness and injustice over the lives of murderers, it proves itself callous where the lives of unborn babies are concerned. No society which does this can long survive, and indeed the collapse of our own society is strongly in evidence. While living only in accord with God's laws, natural and revealed, can ultimately heal our society, there is little sign of this yet happening, since even the Churches claiming to be Christian appear to be influenced almost as much by the Spirit of the political Age as by the One they claim to follow.

Meanwhile, Christians must become more aware of what <u>is</u> Christian teaching and resist the arrogance and domination of clerics who would ride obstinately in the current political bandwagon, ignoring or contradicting teachings and practices that are authentic and traditional.

E.C. (NIT) PICKINGS

RECENT examples of Euro nit-picking have been custard tarts and smoked kippers. Custard tarts, a British delicacy, may become extinct because of health regulations imposed by the E.C. The fact that as far as is known no-one has ever been the worse for eating the tarts is irrelevant. Smoked kippers, as we have known them, may be banned because they are traditionally cured on tenterhooks. The E.C. consider they might conceivably not come up to regulation standards of hygiene. No doubt we shall finish up with hygienic kippers that are not worth eating, but what of that so long as we obey our Brussels masters? French chefs, incidentally, are famed for never scouring omelette pans because that would spoil the taste. The least our government can do is insist that all such pans be thoroughly scrubbed after use. What is sauce for the egg is sauce for the kipper.

TAPES FROM FOREST HOUSE

DAVID IRVING AT THE CLARENDON CLUB
FR. CHARLES COUGHLIN ON THE AIR
DAVID DUKE ON THE DONAHUE SHOW
MOSLEY SPEAKS AT STOWE SCHOOL
RHODESIAN INDEPENDENCE BROADCASTS
THE DISTRACTION OF EVOLUTION
G.K. CHESTERTON BROADCASTS & POEMS
A.K. CHESTERTON SPEAKS
THE MASS AT DOWNHAM MARKET
NATIONAL FRONT AT ROTHERHAM, 1976

£4 each from CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPT.

STOP PRESS!

JANE BIRDWOOD HAS BEEN SUMMONSED TO FACE TRUMPED-UP CHARGES OF "INCITING RACIAL HATRED" AND IS DUE TO APPEAR AT LONDON'S HORSEFERRY ROAD MAGISTRATES COURT ON APRIL 23. JANE IS 77 YEARS OLD, YET REMAINS SPRIGHTLY AND INDEFATIGABLE IN HER FIGHT AGAINST THE MULTI-RACIAL MADNESS. BE THERE ON APRIL 23 OR WRITE HER LETTERS OF SUPPORT AT 31 EASTVALE, ACTON VALE, LONDON W3. REMEMBER - SHE SPEAKS FOR ENGLAND.

THE SERGEANT AND THE GENERAL

HE led the British in the field
And with some help did force to yield
The Guard Republican - 'elite'
And lesser forces, in the heat
And desert sand around Iraq
Where Death could hardly answer back.

So much behoves of amok-run
That Tank Commander mounts the gun
To blast and burn an enemy
And chuckle at proficiency
At night, a hit, a just reward
And shot by TV for record.

The General sums the slaughter thus:
"The greatest quite, totally plus,
"Yet Britain's best - let's not be coy
"We've won and ours is justly joy;
"So ring church-bells back there at home"
No word for thousands' early doom!

More grace came from a lower rank,
A sergeant with a British tank
Expressing sorrow at the vast
Opposing human holocaust.
Nameless he be yet soldierly;
Not one too drunk with victory.

B.E. BIGGS

THE alleged destruction of Kuwait by Iraq was described by an American reporter on the "B"BC World Service as a "mediaeval atrocity." We would like to know where some of these "mediaeval atrocities" took place. Actual atrocities that more readily spring to mind are Katyn or Stalin's destruction of the Ukrainian peasantry or Nero's burning of Rome. By comparison, the Middle Ages appears as a period of more piety and peace than was earlier or has since been enjoyed!

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £8 OVERSEAS £10 U.S. $15 A/M

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.